

REMARKS

In the Office Action of November 29, 2007, claims 1-7, 20, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,260,424 B2 (“Schmidt”). Claims 8-12, 16-18 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of European Patent Application No. EP 0 800 283 (“Heinonen”), U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0017809 A1 (“Garlepp et al.”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,128,486 (“Keskitalo et al.”).

In response, Applicant has canceled claim 12, and has amended claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 13-16, 20, 29 and 30 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references and/or to correct minor errors. As amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 20, 29 and 30 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Schmidt, as explained below. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the amended independent claims 1, 20, 29 and 30, as well as the dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 20, 29 and 30

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas...*,” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Schmidt. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Schmidt. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Schmidt discloses a wireless communication device that includes a SINGLE reconfigurable antenna, as shown in Figs. 1A, 2 and 3, and described in at least column 3, lines 62-66. Thus, the cited reference of Schmidt does not disclose “*an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas...*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Schmidt. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 20, 29 and 30, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 20, 29 and 30 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Schmidt, and requests that the amended independent claims 20, 29 and 30 be allowed as well.

With respect to the amended independent claim 1, the cited reference of Schmidt also does not disclose the limitation of “*each of the antennas having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna,*” which further supports the conclusion that the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Schmidt.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Harald Fischer

Date: February 29, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300